

Filed: February 6, 2006

### REMARKS

Claims 6-23 are pending in the present application. Claims 6-8, 12, 14 and 15 have been amended to further clarify that which was previously claimed and/or to correct scrivener's errors. Reconsideration of the pending Claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

#### Claim Rejections pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6-15, 18-21, and 23 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618 to Shannon. Claims 15, 16 and 22 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shannon in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0112182 to Bajikar (hereinafter referred to as "Bajikar"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections because all of the limitations described in the currently pending Claims are not taught, suggested, or disclosed by the cited prior art, either alone or in combination.

#### Claims 6-11

For example, amended Claim 6 describes registering in a memory of a communication terminal a plurality of portal sites and a corresponding plurality of access points used to access the portal sites, each access point connected to one or more portal sites, and performing access control, when a request to access a site is generated by an application running in the communication terminal, the access control comprising denying access to the site and a first portal site that shares an access point located on a communication path from the communication terminal to the site, when the site is the registered portal site.

Contrary to the assertions on page 3 of the office action mailed April 19, 2007, Shannon does not describe each access point connected to one or more portal sites, nor registration in a memory of a communication terminal of portal sites and corresponding access points. To the contrary, Shannon merely discloses registering sites (or nodes) that a user is not allowed to access, and categorizing prohibited portal sites. Shannon fails to teach or suggest performing access control and denying access to the site and a first portal site that shares an access point located on a communication path from the communication terminal to the site as described in Claim 6.

As described in the example of Figure 1 of Applicant's specification, which should not be construed as limiting upon any of the pending claims, when a prohibited site (400-1) is being selected from a registered site, a use of a communication path(s) (MS100-AP310-400-2 of Fig. 1)

related to the designated site is automatically prohibited in addition to the path MS100-AP310-400-1, since both sites share the access point AP310 located on the communication path to the registered site 400-1. Conversely, Shannon is completely silent and unconcerned with a communication path or a first portal site that shares an access point located on a communication path to a site as described in Claim 6.

Claims 12-15 and 17-18

Amended Claim 12 describes instructions stored in the memory that are executable by the processor to enable a communication path for the communication terminal, in response to a user selection of a portal site of a service provider, the portal site connected with an access point that is included in the communication path used to access the portal site. Shannon, on the other hand, describes a network device, as previously discussed, but fails to describe or suggest a portal site of a service provider that is connected with an access point that is included in the communication path used to access the portal site as described in Claim 12.

Claims 19-21 and 23

Claim 19 describes a communication terminal. On page 7 of the office action mailed April 19, 2007 it was asserted that "Shannon discloses a communication terminal (integration of items 50-53 and network device 100 via item 41 [network link], see Fig. 1." Applicant respectfully traverses that a number of client computer hosts, a network device, a Lan, and a network link as described by Shannon can be "integrated" in order to anticipate the communication terminal as described in Claim 19. Firstly, Claim 19 describes a communication terminal, not a number of discrete pieces of hardware and an interconnecting LAN as described by Shannon. To anticipate a claim pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102, "the identical invention must be shown in as complete a detail as is in the ....claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) and see MPEP 2131. Clearly that is not the case when an "integration" of a conglomeration of network device is asserted as anticipating the claimed invention.

Secondly, even if one overlooks the improper rejection formulated by "integration" of components in a network in order to anticipate Claim 19, the asserted "integration" still fails to describe profiles stored in memory that each include an identifier of a provider portal site and a corresponding identifier of an access point operable to communicate with other communication

networks as described in Claim 19. To the contrary, Shannon describes a database that stores categories that include document locations and IP addresses (Table 3 in Col. 8), which clearly does not include storage of a provider portal site and a corresponding identifier of an access point as described in Claim 19.

Further, Claim 19 describes a display unit operable to receive a user input representative of selection of one of the profiles stored in the memory as a communication route for connection of the communication terminal to a provider server apparatus that corresponds to the selected one of the profiles. On page 8 of the office action, it was asserted that Shannon's browser was equivalent, however, Shannon's browser is not described as receiving a user input representative of selection of one of a plurality of profiles stored in the memory of the communication terminal as a communication route as described in Claim 19. To the contrary, Shannon clearly describes that browsers operable on a client computer allow users to request a web page (Col. 12 lines 31-34), which is not a stored profile, and clearly does not constitute selection of one of the profiles as a communication route as described in Claim 19.

In addition, Claim 19 describes an application manager stored in the memory and executable to determine a first provider portal site that is associated with the identifier of the access point of the selected one of the profiles, and to designate as inhibited sites each of the first provider portal site, and a second provider portal site identified in the selected one of the profiles. Shannon, on the other hand, not only fails to describe determination of any portal site that is associated with an identifier of an access point, but also clearly does not describe determination of a provider portal site that is associated with an identifier of an access point selected from one of a plurality of stored profiles as described in Claim 19. In fact, Shannon is complete silent with regard to any form of stored profiles as described in Claim 19.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, none of the cited references either alone or in combination teach, suggest or describe all the limitations of independent Claims 6, 12 and 19 or the Claims dependent therefrom and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the present rejections. The presently pending claims of this application are allowable over the cited references, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowance for

Serial No. 10/525,099


Filed: February 6, 2006

Request for Continued Examination and Response to Office Action

Filed October 18, 2007

this application. Should the Examiner deem a telephone conference to be beneficial in expediting allowance/examination of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sanders N. Hillis". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

Sanders N. Hillis

Attorney Reg. No. 45,712

Attorney for Applicant

SNH/dlh

**BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE**

**CUSTOMER NO. 27879**

Telephone: 317-636-0886

Facsimile: 317-634-6701